

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### 1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended independent claims 1 and 5. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-7 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

### 2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 5-7 and 1-4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Albers, *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,097,798) in view of Benitez Pelaez, *et al.* (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0190689). Applicant respectfully disagrees.

It appears that the Examiner has read the previously claimed method step: "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node for each session that is transported through the node, the media handling node comprising a gateway of an internet protocol multimedia subsystem domain;" in two separate parts. The Examiner first reads a 5ess switch of Albers on the media handling node of the claims, then cites Benitez Pelaez as disclosing that a media handling node may comprise a gateway of an IMS domain.

Applicant has amended the claims to recite "assigning an extra port to the media-handling node of an internet protocol multimedia subsystem domain for each new session that is transported through the node". (emphasis added) Albers does not read on amended claims 1 and 5 since 1) the 5ess switch of Albers is not "of an IMS domain" and 2) Albers does not teach, disclose, or suggest sessions since only switched communications is disclosed. The combination of Albers and Benitez Pelaez would only disclose the addition of physical ports in a 5ess switch which is connected to a media gateway. As such, the combination of Albers and Benitez Pelaez does not teach, disclose, or suggest additional ports in a media handling node of an IMS domain.

In view of the above arguments, independent claims 1 and 5 are patentable over the combination of Albers and Benitez Pelaez. Dependent claims 2-4, 6, and 7 are patentable at least by virtue of depending from their respective base claim.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Thomas Bethea, Jr., Reg#53987/

Thomas Bethea, Jr  
Registration No. 53,987

Date: June 7, 2010

Ericsson Inc.  
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11  
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4859  
thomas.bethea.jr@ericsson.com